

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are in this application and are presented for consideration. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 9 and 18.

Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner's attention that only claims 1-8 were examined in the Office Action. However, the Preliminary Amendment filed September 7, 2006 included claims 1-20. As such, claims 1-20 should have been examined. Appropriate clarification is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeuchi (U.S. 5,362,090).

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for speaking with Applicant's representative on January 7, 2009. During the interview, Applicant's representatives argued that Nuñez et al. is not a proper prior art reference as Applicant's foreign priority date of March 9, 2004 is prior to the 102(e) date of December 9, 2004 of Nunez et al. The Examiner agreed that Nuñez et al. is not a proper prior art reference. Applicant's representative also argued that Takeuchi does not disclose a wall of a mounting bushing that is integrally connected with an arm body. The Examiner agreed that Figure 3 of Takeuchi does not show an arm body that is integrally connected to a mounting bushing. However, the Examiner suggested that it would be helpful to clarify that the integral connection of the wall to the arm body forms a one piece structure.

The present invention relates to a control arm for a wheel suspension of a motor vehicle. The control arm comprises an arm body that is composed of at least one sheet metal part and a circular mounting bushing for an elastic bearing element. A wall of the mounting bushing is

integrally formed with the arm body. This advantageously provides a one piece mounting bushing arm body structure. The fact that the wall of the mounting bushing is molded in one piece with the arm body is significant in the present invention because it significantly decreases manufacturing costs. This advantageously simplifies the manufacturing of the arm body in that the shaping of the mounting bushing can be performed while the metal sheet component is processed to form the arm body. The prior art as a whole fails to disclose such features and such manufacturing cost saving advantages.

Takeuchi fails to teach and fails to suggest the combination of a mounting bushing having a wall that is formed integrally with an arm body to define a one piece mounting bushing body arm structure. Takeuchi merely discloses a suspension of a motor vehicle wherein a suspension arm 2 is formed by welding an arm pin portion 6 to an arm body 4. The arm body 4 of Takeuchi is formed as a whole in an approximate inverse U-shape in cross section and the arm pin portion 6 is welded to the arm body 4, by which a closed cross section is formed by the arm body 4 and the arm pin portion 6. According to Takeuchi, a central base portion 4b of the arm body 4 is provided with an arm boss 7 (Column 2, line 65 through Column 3, line 2). However, the arm boss 7 of Takeuchi is not formed in one piece with the arm body 4 as claimed. Compared with Takeuchi, a wall of a mounting bushing of the present invention is molded in one piece with an arm body. This advantageously forms an integrally connected arm body mounting bushing structure. This significantly reduces manufacturing costs since the number of mounting steps and production steps are drastically reduced as a result of forming the one piece structure. In contrast to the present invention, Figure 1 of Takeuchi clearly shows

that the arm boss 7 is not integrally formed with the arm body 4. Figure 1 of Takeuchi shows that the arm boss 7 and the arm body 4 are separate parts that are not integrally connected. As such, Takeuchi does not teach or suggest a mounting bushing that is integrally connected to an arm body as featured in the claimed combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner favorably consider claims 1, 9 and 18 as now presented and all claims that respectively depend thereon.

Claims 1 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nuñez et al. (U.S. 7,293,787).

It is Applicant's position that Nunez et al. is not a proper prior art reference. Nuñez et al. has a 102(e) date of December 9, 2004. However, Applicant's application has a foreign priority date of March 9, 2004, which is prior to the 102(e) date of December 9, 2004 of Nuñez et al. As such, it is believed that Nuñez et al. is not a proper prior art reference.

Even assuming Nuñez et al. is a proper prior art reference, Nuñez et al. does not provide any teaching or suggestion for a mounting bushing that has a wall that is integrally formed with an arm body to define a one piece mounting bushing arm body structure. Nuñez et al. discloses a suspension arm for a motor vehicle. According to Nuñez et al., the suspension arm comprises a body 1 which is linked to strut holders of a wheel of a vehicle via a ball joint 2 and to a chassis of the vehicle via a front silent-block 3 and a rear silent-block 4. The front silent-block 3 of Nuñez et al. reveals a cylindrical body from the surface of which some pairs of securing flaps 11 project radially which are inserted in a slot 9 defined in a concavely curved front housing 9 of the body 1, in which they appear folded alternatively in opposite directions. The front silent-

block 3 of Nuñez et al. is joined to the body 1 via weld beads 10 obtained by laser welding. However, the front silent-block 3 of Nuñez et al. is not formed in one piece with the body 1 to form a one piece structure as claimed. Compared with Nuñez et al., a wall of a mounting bushing of the present invention is integrally formed with an arm body. This advantageously forms a one piece mounting bushing arm body structure. This advantageously saves manufacturing costs since the mounting bushing is already integrally connected to the arm body. This significantly reduces the number of production and mounting steps required in connecting the arm body to the mounting bushing. Nuñez et al. does not disclose such manufacturing saving advantages since Nuñez et al. only discloses that the front silent-block 3 is connected to a body 1 via inserting flaps 11 into a slot 9 and welding the front silent-block 3 to the body 1 via laser welding. This disadvantageously requires numerous, complicated mounting steps of the silent-block 3 to the body 1, which significantly increases manufacturing costs. As such, the prior art as a whole takes a different approach and fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner favorably consider claims 1, 9 and 18 as now presented and all claims that respectively depend thereon.

Claims 3-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi.

As previously disclosed above, Takeuchi does not provide any teaching or suggestion for the combination of a wall of a mounting bushing that is integrally formed with an arm body. As such, the prior art as a whole does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the

cited prior art references do not teach or suggest important features of the claimed combination.

Accordingly, all claims define over the prior art as a whole.

Favorable consideration on the merits is requested.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,



By: _____
John James McGlew
Registration No. 31,903
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

- and -



By: _____
Brian M. Duncan
Registration No. 58,505
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

JJM:BMD
72331-7

DATED: February 4, 2009
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-
0410.